DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 754 CG 016 160

AUTHOR Filsinger, Erik E.
TITLE Implications in the Choice of Marital Observation Coding Systems: A User's Guide.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations (Milwaukee, WI, October 13-17, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Theories; Comparative Analysis; Counseling Techniques; *Data Collection; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Relationship; Literature Reviews; *Marriage; Marriage Counseling; Models; *Research Methodology; *Sociometric Techniques; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS *Marital Observation Coding Systems

ABSTRACT

Observational studies of marital interaction have become increasingly popular in recent years, resulting from trends in family research including a movement towards the measurement of behavior rather than attitudes. In fact, there is now a proliferation of coding systems, but no "user's guide" for the researcher. This paper overviews the principal marital observation coding systems, suggests the fundamental characteristics of each, and compares and contrasts the content of the coding systems. Theoretical considerations involved in the use of each coding system are outlined for the five systems, including: (1) the Marital Interaction Coding System; (2) the Couple Interaction Scoring System; (3) the Dyadic Interaction Scoring Code; (4) the Marital and Family Interaction Coding Systems; and (5) the Coding Scheme for Interpersonal Conflict. The appended tables contain comparative information for each of the five coding systems. (Author/JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220754

IMPLICATIONS IN THE CHOICE OF MARITAL OBSERVATION CODING SYSTEMS: A USER'S GUIDE

Erik E. Filsinger
Arizona State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Erik Filsinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 016160

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Milwaukee, WI, October 13-17, 1981.

Implications in the Choice of Marital Observation Coding Systems: A User's Guide

Erik E. Filsinger
Arizona State University

This paper overviews the principal marital observation coding systems and suggests the fundamental characteristics of each. The content of the coding systens are compared and contrasted. Theoretical considerations involved in the use of each coding system are outlined.

Observational studies of marital interaction have become increasingly popular in the last few years. Their popularity results from a number of trends in family research including a movement towards measuring behavior rather than attitudes, the need for better diagnostic and assessment techniques in marital therapy, and the increasing belief that marital distress arises from dysfunctional patterns of interaction between the spouses (cf. Markman et al. 1981). Filsinger and his collegues (1981) note that no matter what the theoretical perspective, researchers are advocating behavioral modes of collecting data to test their hypotheses or their treatment programs. Indeed, there is proliferation of coding systems. The potential user of marital observation coding systems must decide the relative merits of each. The individual researcher or practitioner reviewing the burgeoning research must be able to sensibly compare findings. In short, we are at a point where there is a need to take stock of these coding systems in order to more intelligibly use them in research or in practice.

On one hand, part of this need is being met. Recent reviews of the field (e.g., Cromwell et al., 1976; Gottman, 1979; Markman et al., 1981; Snyder, in press; Weiss and Margolin, 1977) have gone a long way in integrating research findings into some general perspectives on the behavioral nature of marriage. Reliability assessment (Hartmann and Gardner, 1981) and data analysis techniques (Bakeman, 1977; Gottman, 1979; Gottman and Notarius, 1978; Notarius et al., 1981; Sackett, 1978) have been the subject of extensive reviews in their own right. Less work has been done on the comparative validity of coding procedures (cf. Arkowitz et al., 1981; See Billings, 1979, for an exception). Comparing findings across studies can be a tricky business when the reader does not know whether what constitutes "positive" behavior under one coding system is equivalent to the "positive" behavior under another. In short, there is no user's guide to marital observation systems. The purpose of the present paper is to offer such a guide to the substantive aspects of the leading coding systems.

Riskin and Faunce (1972) assert that much of the family interaction research that was undertaken during the 60's was characterized by variability in the factors studied and "casualness in reporting details," resulting in difficulty in comparing findings. They suggest that a number of factors, e.g., sources of theories, research biases, hypotheses, and coding categories, could lead to concepts being operationalized differently. Knowing the basic similarities and dissimilarities of coding systems would facilitate integrating research findings.

This step is also important for theory development. The current theoretical efforts in family studies are to a large extent research based. For example, the techniques of theory development and the theories offered in Burr et al. (1979) are all grounded in research. Connections between concepts are stated in propositional form. These propositions arise from studies which have found connections between variables which operationalize the concepts. However, it must be known that the measure of marital satisfaction, for example, in one study corresponds to the measure of marital satisfaction in another study before the findings can be joined in an empirical generalization. While this is likely not always done thoroughly enough even with self-report attitudinal measures, relatively more individuals are familiar with traditional self-report measures than they are with the respective coding systems. A user's guide to observational coding systems would facilitate the development of theoretical propositions about the nature of marital interaction.

The present paper will proceed in two parts. A brief overview will be given to a wider range of available techniques. An in-depth discussion of five coding systems will follow. The five are chosen because of their specific focus on marital interaction, their popularity and usage, their recency and sophistication, and their structural comparability. Selection of those with structural comparability enables us to bypass some of the gross, obvious differences and to focus instead on the specific aspects of the codes themselves.

Observational Systems

Through the course of marital observation research, a wide variety of techniques have been suggested. One of the earliest techniques was the Interaction Process Analysis (IPA) associated with the work of Bales and his colleagues on small group research (Bales and Strodtbeck, 1951). Strodtbeck (1951) applied IPA to written protocols of interactions of couples in three cultures generated by the Revealed Differences procedure. The criticisms of the IPA technique include its limited applicability to marital situations and the degree to which the subjective judgment of coders is relied upon to score the protocols (cf. Gottman, 1979). Moreover, there appears to be a large amount of method variance associated with various scoring procedures of the IPA (Waxler and Mishler, 1966).

Goodrich and Boomer (1963) present some findings based on observational coding of interaction generated around the Color Matching Technique. The coded behaviors included activity level, effectiveness of communication, and dominance-submission, among others. However, the precise meaning of the behaviors is neither given nor offered. Associated with this work at the National Institute of Mental Health, Ryder (1968) reports on differences in the interaction of husband-wife dyads versus that of married strangers. His coding system is specific to behaviors likely to occur during interactions generated by the Color Matching Test.

Connected with the family therapy tradition, Mishler and Waxler (1968) present a major systematic study of interaction in the families of schizophrenics. A wide variety of codes are applied including IPA and a mixed, eclectic bag of codes used in the literature up to the point of their study. The codes are independently applied in repeated passes through the typescripts of the interaction. However, Gottman (1979:55) criticizes their work for ignoring nonverbal delivery, relying instead on the denotative and connotative meanings

of the words themselves.

During the same time period, behaviorists began to look at family interaction. Patterson and his collegues at Oregon were strongly influenced by ethological considerations. Their coding system (Patterson et al., 1969; Jones et al., 1974) is a precursor to perhaps the most popular modern-day coding system, the Marital Interaction Coding System (MICS), a system directly related to behavioral concepts of marital distress and behavioral marital therapy. Conger and McLeod (1977) have presented the Social Interaction Scoring System (SISS), one of the few coding systems specifically developed for use with portable data collectors. In addition, it has the distinct advantage of dealing with summary categories at the initial level of coding. Holm (1981) suggests initially coding at the summatory level if the analyses are going to be done on summed categories anyways. In a different line of research, but still important, assertiveness training has been applied married patients. Videotaped interactions have been coded for such assertiveness behaviors as looking, loudness, speech duration, and smiles (Eisler et al., 1974).

Two other coding procedures can be mentioned as well. The Allred Interaction Analysis (Allred and Graff, 1979) is developed to measured Adlerian conceptions of marital communication. The focus is on vertical relationships and horizontal relationships. It is being used in a project to measure both physiological and behavioral reactions to marital interaction (Allred et al., 1981). The Home Observational Assessment Method (Steinglass, 1979; Steinglass and Tislenko, 1981) was developed out of family systems theory. It was greatly influenced by the Patterson coding system mentioned above, though the theoretical biases were different. The HOAM is one of the coding systems most specifically developed for naturalistic observation in family homes.

In-Depth Analysis of Coding Systems

The five coding systems selected for further analysis in this report are the Marital Interaction Coding System (MICS, Hops et al., 1972), the Couple Interaction Scoring System (CISS, Gottman et al., 1978; Gottman, 1979; Notarius and Markman, 1981), the Dyadic Interaction Scoring Code (DISC, Filsinger, 1980; Filsinger, 1981), the Marital and Family Interaction Coding Systems (MFICS, Olson and Ryder, 1978), and the Coding Scheme for Interpersonal Conflict (CSIC, Raush et al., 1974). As mentioned above, these five are chosen on the basis of their focus on marital interaction, their usage, their recency, and their structural comparability. Together they represent developments connected to the traditions cited above. In addition, they are interrelated. The MICS is related to the earlier efforts at Oregon. The CISS is related to the MICS and the MFICS. The DISC is a hybrid of all of them and the machine operationalization of the SISS. The MFICS was undoubtably influenced by the work of others at NIMH, as was the CSIC.

Table 1 contains a comparison of basic features of the coding systems. While there are quite a few basic similarities, there are also some significant differences. The CISS has the unique feature of separate coding of affect as positive, negative, or neutral for each of eight summary codes. This aspect of coding the nonverbal communication was picked up by White (1980) in his report on the topography of marital interaction and Gottman (1980) has shown cross-situational consistency of nonverbal affect. The question of the coding unit is important because it is the basic social act assigned a code. Using the thought unit (CISS) or the statement (DISC, MFICS, CSIC) is preferable to

a timed-block (MICS) because they reflect floor switches. While MFICS and the CSIC code for the entire statement, the DISC marks the beginning and ending of statements and allows for separate codings of specific behaviors if they occur within the statement. This allows it to be exhaustive, as are the MICS, CISS, and CSIC, without having to content code each and every behavior. However, while the MICS and the CISS are pretty objective, the DISC is much more subjective. Because it is set up for use with the Datamyte 900 Data Collector, it calls for spontaneous code assignment to behavior in order to make data entry during on-going behavior. Time for reflection is nil. While the other systems are pretty flexible as to type of task, the MFICS is inherently tied to the Inventory of Marital Conflicts (Olson and Ryder, 1970) and really cannot be used to code data produced by other interaction, especially free-flowing discussion. The DISC is the only one set-up to code live interaction. However, it requires a lot of up-front money for the Datamytes and a lot of coder training.

The content of the coding systems is presented in Tables 2 through 7. Rather than supplanting the tables, the text which follows merely highlights a few of the potential points. The tables should be studied themselves, preferably with a teaching manual from each system. The categories used to compare and contrast the codes were: social influence attempts, reactions to social influence attempts, affect loaded communications, problem solving statements, conversation maintenance behaviors, and residual coding. This scheme was arrived at after many hours of pouring over the codebooks trying to find common dimensions. While others might meaningfully arrive at other categories, these were felt to bring out some of the more interesting comparisons that could allow the potential user to see what sort of behaviors the coding system was really getting at. The comparison should also allow the potential user to see theoretical implications of the use of one coding system versus the other, primarily in terms of the empirical generalizations that could result.

Social Influence Attempts

The contrast between the coding systems is marked on this dimension (see Table 2). The CSIC is very subtle and complex in capturing this dimension of marital interaction. Codes such as Offering Something Else as a Way of Winning One's Goal and Appealing to the Love of Another are intuitively appealing, but call for a fair degree of coder inference from the situation. The distinctions are perhaps too fine for someone not willing to thoroughly immerse themselves in the nature of marital coercion. The MICS distinguishes between Commands (requests for immediate action) and Negative and Positive things the spouse wants his or her partner to do. Positive refers to adding on behavior. Negative refers to requests not to do something.

Reactions to Social Influence

Table 3 contains the coded reactions to social influence attempts. There is a pretty high degree of face similarity among the codes. Both the MICS and the CISS allow for the acceptance or denial of responsibility. The compliance codes mean different things. Whereas the MICS calls for immediate physical compliance to a command, e.g., "Pick up that pencil," and the partner does so within 30 seconds (compliance), the CISS and the DISC allow for verbal assent to later behavior, "I will." On this dimension the MICS and the CISS are quite similar and are both a little more specific than are the others.

It should be noted here that the groupings represented by the present dimensions do not necessarily correspond to the groupings used in the respective coding systems. In the case of the CISS, two symbolic codes are offered with each descriptor. The first is specific content code; the second is the code used for coding. This second one represents a preliminary grouping. While in Table 3 the groups are consistent, the reader may have noticed that Command is coded a DG (disagree). The rest of the DG's are in Table 3. Nevertheless, for the purposes of the present comparison of coding systems, the codes are grouped on the basis of specific content, as opposed to the functional grouping of the CISS (Gottman, 1979).

Affect Loaded Communications

Positive and negative reactions to self and partner are contained in Table 4. Positive refers to strength and vigor whereas negative refers to weakness and doubt. It should be kept in mind that the CISS has separate affect codes and the present assignments were made on the basis of the content. It is interesting that reflexive affect (onto Self) is not a key part of the coding systems. The CSIC's codes regarding avoiding and accepting blame were put here rather than under reactions to influence attempts because they focused much more on blame and guilt and therefore had a distinctively negative flavor in contrast to the somewhat similar codes of the CISS and MICS included in Table 3. The mindreading behaviors of the CISS also appeared to have a negative flavor, at least as far as the examples given in the codebook. There are a number of places where the DISC differs from the other coding systems in its attempt to code responses which fit this general dimension. For example, the CISS and the CSIC would code, "I think that was well put," or "That's a good idea," under Direct Agreement and Accepting Other's Plan, respectively, whereas the DISC would assign a Positive Partner code because of the human supportiveness of the statements. In another example, "Are you upset?" would be coded as a question by the CISS but as positive affect toward partner by the DISC.

Problem Solving Statements

Table 5 contains problem solving and orienting codes. Anything having to do with defining the problem, communicating about how the problem solving is going, getting back to the issue at hand, or related to furthering the problem solving effectiveness (reflective listening/summarizing) was included here. All of the coding systems are "rich" on this dimension, perhaps reflecting the interest of family scholars in this dimension as well as the importance of problem solving behaviors in many conceptions of marital distress. Markman and his collegues (1981) note, however, that behaviors such as expressing feelings, mindreading, and summarizing do <u>not</u> appear to distinguish distressed from nondistressed relationships. This finding lies in contrast to the expectations derived from the marital therapy literature. Nevertheless, the coding systems do focus on these and the CISS in particular has a great deal of its content devoted to it (11 out of 28 content codes).

Both the MFICS and the CSIC show greater concern with who starts or initiates things. In other places too (Outcome Agreement and Disagreement, previous table), the MFICS shows this concern with suggesting something first. That feature is likely related directly to the interest in family power by Olson and his collegues. Indeed, the objective scoring of the IMC is in terms of win scores, that is, convincing your spouse that your initial idea was best.

Conversation Maintenance

The behaviors in this category have to do with keeping the flow of interaction going while not being specifically content-oriented (see Table 6). Several of the codes involve behaviors of the spouse who does not have the speaking turn. The MICS' Attention and Not Tracking codes and the DISC's Start-Stop Gazing have to do with paying attention to the partner's speech. The two Assent codes and the Back-Channel code are roughly equivalent. These also correspond to the CSIC's Agreeing with the Other's Statement, which belongs here rather than with true agreement. The assent codes reflect, "I am here listening to you." Only the CISS does not concern itself with humor or laughter directly. Instead, it captures these codes through positive nonverbal communication (affect coding).

Residual Coding

In order to be exhaustive, the coding systems have codes for statements which to do not fit the more purposeful categories listed above (see Table 7). For example, the MICS has the code "Talk" and the DISC has a start and stop code for each speaking turn. It also appears that information codes are included partly to catch statements which don't fit the other categories.

Comparison of Groupings of Codes

Researchers seldom do data analysis at the level of the specific codes just discussed. Instead they group them. Often it is on an a priori basis (MICS, DISC, CSIC), but it also can be correlational (MFICS) or the result of an analysis of functional similarity (CISS). Table 8 contains the comparison of the cross-classification between the summatory groupings used in this paper and the summatory groupings offered by original users of the coding systems. The MICS' codes were grouped into Facilitating and Disrupting behavior groups by Patterson and his collegues (1975), although other more complex and/or simplified schemes have been offered (cf. Markman, et al., 1981). The Facilitating behaviors correspond to the cross-section of positive behaviors in the present scheme. Similarly, the Disrupting behaviors correspond to the negative cross-section of codes. Interestingly, Patterson et al. keyed Accept Responsibility negatively in the Facilitating behaviors. That may suggest that accepting responsibility is a negative self-act and it may support putting the CSIC's accept responsibility in that category. It may also be that Accept Responsibility should not be in the positive, agreement segment of reactions to social influence for either the MICS or the CISS (see Table 3 above). It should be noted that Wieder and Weiss (1980) broke the MICS codes into the following groups: problem solving, verbal positive, verbal negative, nonverbal positive, and nonverbal negative.

The same easy fit between the present and the original coding system schemes exists for the DISC broken down into Facilitative and Dysfunctional behaviors. The pneumonic value of the DISC codes can be seen in that the second digit of positive cues are 1 whereas the second digit of negative cues are mostly 2.

There is much less similarity between the CISS' original groups and the present groups. In large part this is due to the present scheme focusing on positive-negative aspects. The CISS content codes are not meant to be inherently positive or negative; the affect codes of the CISS measure positiveness-negativeness. Nevertheless it is interesting to note the dissimilarity of schemes, in particular the large variation of CISS groupings represented in

the problem solving category.

The MFICS codes are systematically related to the categorization of the present paper. The Affect dimension is split across conversation maintenance and affect-loaded communications. The Conflict dimension is included under reaction to social influence, problem solving, and residual coding.

There was less correspondence between the categorization of codes used to structure this discussion and the categories of codes offered by Raush and his collegues (1974). Whereas Changing the Subject (13) and Diverting the Other's Attention as a Manuever to Gain One's End (26) were classified herein as social influence strategies, Raush classified them as Resolution of Conflict. Similarly, Appealing to the Love of Another (37) was classified herein as a social influence ploy, Raush offered them in their own category. Raush's coercion and attack codes were split into social influence attempts and negative affect toward partner.

Coding Systems and Distressed Relationships

If in fact most data analysis is done at the level of grouped, or summed, data from specific codes, it makes a big difference for theory development just what specific codes go into those groups. To take one example, research on distinguishing distressed from nondistressed marriages has focused to a large extend on positive and negative behaviors. Using the MICS, Birchler and his collegues (1975) concluded that distressed relationships are characterized by more negative and fewer positive behaviors. However, using the CISS Gottman and his collegues (1977) did not find support for the differences on positiveness of nonverbal behaviors, leading them to question whether or not positiveness distinguishes distressed and nondistressed relationships. In fact, ignoring affect coding, the only significant difference on the content codes which could be considered positive was for the wives' Agreement code. The nondistressed wives agreed significantly more often, a positive reaction to social influence attempts in our present scheme. However, it should also be noted that agreement is one of the few content codes in the CISS which fits a positive-negative dimension in itself. Perhaps the argument could be made that the CISS doesn't pick up content positiveness differences between distressed and nondistressed relationships because the content positiveness is hidden in all the communication process related grouping of codes. On the other hand, Gottman and his collegues (1977) support their findings by suggesting that the MICS confounds content and affect and that it is positive affect which is important. At any rate, three types of differences between the coding systems could conceivably account for the inconsistent results and the different theoretical propositions which could be derived from the results. First, the CISS separates out content and affect coding; the MICS does not. Second, a great deal of the CISS codes focus on communication process behaviors, rather than on more inherently positive or negative behaviors toward partner (MICS). Third, the summatory groups reflect this last difference. The CISS focuses on communication processes whereas the MICS is positive-negative oriented.

Overview

The MICS is a coding system firmly grounded in behaviorist principles. It is well-rounded, has a great deal of research behind it, and fits most any situation. Its most direct application is the behavioral assessment of marital distress. The MICS and the CISS have received wider psychometric analysis than the other systems. Wieder and Weiss (1980) present a supportive

generalizibility study on the MICS. Gottman and his collegues (1977) critique the fact that the MICS confounds verbal and nonverbal channels of communication, but even the CISS is not able to completely separate the channels (Markman et al., 1981). One potential weakness is the coding unit (30 second time blocks). The major resources required are videotapes and trained coders. Coding takes some time.

The CISS has some of the same social learning origins, but it is greatly influenced by consideration of the dynamics of the communication process (summarizing, mindreading, etc.). These dynamics have not been as useful as were originally thought. In many ways, however, the CISS produces the highest quality data, in large part due to the separate coding of content and affect. On the other hand, the CISS is labor-intensive. One hour of videotape requires 28 hours of coding! While the CISS does an excellent job getting at problem solving behaviors, it is a little short on other important aspects of marital interaction, e.g., social influence and manipulation.

The DISC is the only machine-aided coding system discussed. That is both its strength and its weakness, trade-offs of the research game. It can be used to code live interaction in the laboratory or in the home. Once set up, it has the quickest turn-around time with the data going directly from the machine into the main computer. On the other hand, it requires the up-front outlay of monies for the Datamytes. Its basis is again social learning and it is set up primarily to examine codes which can easily be put into positive and negative categories. Some attempt has been made to use the verbal output of subjects to reflect on the nature of their cognitions, e.g., positive self-affect behaviors may indicate facilitative thought patterns whereas negative self-affect may indicate dysfunctional thoughts. Nevertheless, the DISC has only been used in a couple of studies, only one of which has been reported (Filsinger, 1980; 1981).

The MFICS's strength is its ability to capture the power dynamics of marital interaction, but its use is limited to highly structured, impersonal tasks (e.g., the IMC). Because of this it also lacks some depth in capturing other potential aspects of marital interaction.

In contrast, the CSIC is perhaps overly rich. It has the most intuitive coding system, but it is very complex. Because it assumes the coder is able to accurately read very subtle interpersonal dynamics which reflect varying motivations and intentions, it probably will not be satisfactory to the more behaviorist scholar. Interestingly, while it is full of coercion and social influence, it does not have a code for compliance or noncompliance. In this sense, it is not really set up to measure that aspect of power or those effects of social influence attempts.

Summary

Five coding systems were examined in depth and several others were overviewed. Each coding system has its own strengths and weaknesses. Potential users must weigh these out for themselves. However, each coding system also has its own unique character. This character would affect research findings and the development of theoretical propositions. For example, the CISS was developed in part to test some communication principles - it was not developed to measure power, as was more the case with the MFICS. Likewise, the behaviorist would be more at home with the MICS, especially where therapy was involved. Hopefully, potential users can use this discussion in choosing a marital observation coding system to fit their needs.

References

Allred, G.H., and Graff, T.T.
1979 "The AIA, a mental map for communicators: A preliminary report." Journal of Marital and Family Therapy 5: 33-42.

Allred, G.H., Harper, J.M., Wadham, R.A., and Woolley, B.H.
1981 "Expanding the frontiers of interaction research." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Arkowitz, H., Lamke, L.K., and Filsinger, E.E.
1981 "Issues of behavioral assessment: Final reflections." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bakeman, R.
1977 "Untangling streams of behavior: Sequential analyses of observation data." In G.P. Sackett (ed.), Observing Behavior: Data Collection and Analysis Procedures. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Bales, R.F., and Strodtbeck, F.L.
1951 "Phases in group problem-solving." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 46: 485-495.

Billings, A.
1979 "Conflict resolution in distressed and nondistressed married couples." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 47: 368-376.

Birchler, G.R., Weiss, R.L., Vincent, J.P.
1975 "Multimethod analysis of social reinforcement exchange between maritally distressed and nondistressed spouse and stranger dyad." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 31: 349-360.

Burr, W.R., Hill, R., Nye, F.I., and Reiss, I.L.
1979 Contemporary Theories About the Family. Vol. 1. New York: MacMillan.

Conger, R.D., and McLeod, D.
1977 "Describing behavior in small groups with the datamyte event recorder." Behavior Research Methods of Instrumentation 9: 418-424.

Cromwell, R.E., Olson, D.H.L., and Fournier, D.G.
1976 "Tools and techniques for diagnosis and evaluation in marital and family therapy." Family Process 15: 1-49.

Eisler, R.M., Miller, P.M., Herson, M., and Alford, H.
1974 "Effects of assertive training on marital interaction." Archives of General Psychiatry 30: 643-649.

Filsinger, E.E.
1980 "A machine-aided marital behavioral assessment technique: The Dyadic Interaction Scoring Code." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the National Council on Family Relations, Portland, October.

Filsinger, E.E.
1981 "The Dyadic Interaction Scoring Code." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Filsinger, E.E., Lewis, R.A., and McAvoy, P.
1981 "Trends and prospects for observing marriage." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Goodrich, D.W., and Boomer, D.S.
1963 "Experimental assessment of modes of conflict resolution." Family Process 2: 15-24.

Gottman, J.M.
1979 Marital Interaction: Experimental Investigations. New York: Academic.

Gottman, J.M.
1980 "Consistency of nonverbal affect and affect reciprocity in marital interaction." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 48: 711-717.

Gottman, J.M., Markman, H., and Notarius, C.
1977 "The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39: 461-477.

Gottman, J.M., and Notarius, C.
1978 "Sequential analysis of observational data using Marker chains." In T.R. Kratochwill (Ed.), Single Subject Research. New York: Academic.

Hartmann, D.P., and Gardner, W.
1981 "Considerations in assessing the reliability of observations." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Holm, R.A.
1981 "Using data logging equipment." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Hops, H., Mills, T.A., Patterson, G.R., and Weiss, R.L.
1972 Marital Interaction Coding System. Eugene: Oregon Research Institute.

Jones, R.R., Reid, J.B., and G.R. Patterson
1974 "Naturalistic observation in clinical assessment." In P. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in Psychological Assessment. Vol. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Markman, H.J., Notarius, C.I., Stephen, T., and Smith, R.J.
1981 "Behavioral observation systems for couples: The current status." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Mishler, E.G., and Waxler, N.E.
1968 Interaction in Families. New York: Wiley.

Notarius, C.I., Krokoff, L.J., and Markman, H.J.
1981 "Analysis of observational data." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Notarius, C.I., and Markman, H.J.
1981 "The Couples Interaction Scoring System." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Olson, D.H., and Ryder, R.G.
1970 "The Inventory of Marital Conflicts (IMC): An experimental interaction procedure." Journal of Marriage and the Family 32: 443-448.

Olson, D.H., and Ryder, R.G.
1978 Marital and Family Interaction Coding System (MFICS): Abbreviated Coding Manual. St. Paul: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota.

Patterson, G.R., Hops, H., and Weiss, R.L.
1975 "Interpersonal skills training for couples in early stages of conflict." Journal of Marriage and the Family 37: 295-303.

Patterson, G.R., Ray, R.S., Shaw, D.A., and Cobb, J.A.
1969 Manual for Coding of Family Interactions. Eugene: Oregon Research Institute.

Raush, H.L., Barry, W.A., Hertel, R.K., and Swain, M.A.
1974 Communication, Conflict and Marriage. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Riskin, J., and Faunce, E.E.
1972 "An evaluative review of family interaction research." Family Process 11: 365-455.

Ryder, R.G.
1968 "Husband-wife dyads versus married strangers." Family Process 7: 233-238.

Sackett, G.P.
1978 "The lag sequential analysis of contingency and cyclicity in behavioral interaction research. In J. Osofsky (Ed.), Handbook of Infant Development. New York: Wiley.

Snyder, D.K.
in press "Advances in marital assessment." In C.D. Spielberger and J.N. Butcher (Eds.), Advances in Personality Assessment. Vol. 1. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Steinglass, P.
1979 "The Home Observation Assessment Method." Family Process 18: 337-354.

Steinglass, P., and Tislenko, L.
1981 "The Home Observation Assessment Method." In E.E. Filsinger and R.A. Lewis (Eds.), Assessing Marriage: New Behavioral Approaches. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Strodtbeck, F.L.
1951 "Husband-wife interaction over revealed differences." American Sociological Review 16: 468-473.

Waxler, N.E., and Mishler, E.G.
1966 "Scoring and reliability problems in Interaction Process Analysis: A methodological note." Sociometry 29: 28-40.

Weiss, R.L., and Margolin, G.
1977 "Assessment of marital conflict and accord." In A.R. Ciminero H. Adams, and K. Calhoun (Eds.), Handbook of Behavioral Assessment. New York: Wiley.

White, J.M.
1980 "A topographical analysis of marital interaction." Paper presented at the Theory Construction and Methodology Workshop, NCFR, Portland, October.

Wieder, G.B., and Weiss, R.L.
1980 "Generalizability theory and the coding of marital interactions." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 48: 469-477.

Table 1. Basic Features of the Marital Observation Coding Systems

Feature	MICS	CISS	DISC	MPICS	CSIC
Topic Addressed	Marital Distress	Couple's Interaction and Communication Skills	Social Competence	Problem-Solving	Interpersonal Conflict
Situation	Clinic/Laboratory	Laboratory	Home/Laboratory	Laboratory	Laboratory
Task Capability	Any Interaction	Any Interaction	Any Interaction	Inventory of Marital Conflicts	Improvisations (primarily)
Primary Medium	Video	Video	Live/Video	Audio	Video
Coding Unit	30 Second Block of Interaction	Thought Unit	Statement/ Occurrence	Statement	Statement
Number of Categories	28	24	23	28	36
Frequency Data Analysis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sequential Data Analysis	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Coder Training	Easy/Moderate	Moderate	Difficult	Easy	Difficult
Degree of Subjectivity Called For	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate/High
Machine Aided Data Collection	no	no	yes	no	no
Usage	Widespread	Moderate	Narrow	Widespread	Moderate
Theoretical Basis	Social Learning/ Behavioral Systems	Social Learning/ Communication	Social Learning/ Cognitive Behavior	Role/Conflict	Psychoanalytic/ Systems

Table 2. Social Influence Attempts in Coding Systems

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Command (CM)	Command (CM/DG)	Request for Change in partner (30)	Partisan Opinion (34)	Withholding Information (4)
				Giving Cognitive Reasons for Action (7)
Interrupt (IN)		Interruptions (17)	Reiteration (44)	Changing the Subject (13)
Negative Solution (NS)				Diverting the Other's Attention as a Maneuver to Gain One's Aim (26)
Positive Solution (PS)				Appealing to Fairness (31)
				Appealing to Other's Motives (33)
				Offering Something Else as a Way of Winning One's Goal (35)
				Appealing to the Love of Another (37)
				Pleading and Coaxing (40)
				Using Power or Set of Circumstances (41)
				Commanding (47)
				Threatening the Other (55)
				Demanding Compensation (48)

Table 3. Reactions to Social Influence Attempts in Coding Systems

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Positive				
Agree (AG)	Direct Agreement (DA/AG)	Agreement (21)	Outcome Agreement (51)	Accepting the Other's Plans, Actions, Ideas, Motives, or Feelings (23)
Accept Responsibility (AR)	Accepts Responsibility (AR/AG)	Compliance (31)	Process Agreement (52)	
Compliance (CO)	Accepts Modification (AM/AG)			
	Compliance (CP/AG)			
Negative				
Disagree (DG)	Direct Disagreement (DD/DG)	Disagreement (22)	Outcome Disagreement (61)	Denying the Validity of the Other's Argument With or Without the Use of Counterarguments (11)
Deny Responsibility (DR)	Disagreement with Rationale Supplied (DRA/DG)	Noncompliance (32)	Process Disagreement (62)	
Excuse (EX)				Recognizing the Other's Move as a Strategy or Calling the Other's Bluff (43)
Noncompliance (NC)	Noncompliance (NC/DG)			
No Response (NR)	Yes, but (YB/DG)			

Table 4. Affect Loaded Communications in the Coding Systems

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Self--Positive				
	Feeling (f/PF)	Positive Self-Statements (41)		
Self--Negative				
Complain (CP)	Feeling (F/PF)	Negative Self-Statements (42)	Disapproval of Self/ Self Doubt (63)	Giving up or Leaving the Scene (10)
				Avoiding Blame or Responsibility (19)
				Accepting Blame or Responsibility (20)
				Seeking Reassurance (24)
Partner--Positive				
Approve (AP)		Positive Partner Statements (51)		Showing Concern for the Other's Feelings (21)
Positive Physical (PP)		Positive Physical (91)		Offering Help or Reassurance (28)
Partner--Negative				
Criticize (CR)	Mindreading Feeling, Attitude or Opinion (MR)	Negative Affect Partner (52)	Disapproval of Spouse/ Others (64)	Rejecting the Other (45)
Put Down (PU)		Negative Physical (92)		Inducing Guilt or Attack-the Other's Motives (51)
Turn Off (TO)	Mindreading Behavior (MR)			Disparaging the Other (53).

Table 5. Problem Solving and Orienting Statements

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Compromise (CS)	Back on the Beam #1 (BB1/CT)	Problem Description (20)	Initiation (01)	Opening the Issue or Probe (1)
Problem Description (PO)	Back on the Beam #2 (BB2/CT)	Introducing a Compromise (36)	Outcome Question (11)	Suggesting a Course of Action (5)
Question (QU)	Clarification Request (CR/CT)	Goal Orientation (43)	Self Disclosure (31)	Exploring the Consequences of a Course of Action (8)
	Generalized Problem Talk (GPT/PF)	Requesting Clarification or Information (45)	Reiteration (44)	Attempting to Make Up (25)
	Metacommunication (MC/CT)			Introducing a Compromise (27)
	Nonspecific Plan (NPL/PS)			Offering to Collaborate in Planning (29)
	Plan (PL/PS)			
	Relationship Issue Problem Talk (RI/PF)			
	Summarizes Other (SO/SO)			
	Summarizes Both (SB/SO)			
	Summarizes Self (SS/SS)			

Table 6. Conversation Maintenance Behaviors in Coding Systems

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Assent (AS)	Assent (AS/AG)	Back-Channel (15)	Laughter (04)	Conventional Remark (0)
Attention (AT)		Start-Stop Gazing (61-62)	Raising Voice Tone (06)	Agreeing with the Other's Statement (6)
Humor (HM)		Laugh (79)		Using Humor (15)
Laugh (LA)				
Not Tracking (NT)				

Table 7. Residual Coding and Special Codes

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Normative (NO)	Blurp (BL/PR)	Start-Stop Talking (11-12)	Reading (21)	Seeking Information (2)
Talk (TA)	Relationship Information (RI/PS)	Reference to Drugs (18)	Relevant Information (26)	Giving Information (3)
	Nonrelationship Information (NRI/PS)		Relevant Opinions (36)	
	Nonrelationship Opinion (NRF/PS)		Uncoded Statements (08)	

Table 8. Summary Codes Typically Employed With Coding System

MICS	CISS	DISC	MFICS	CSIC
Facilitating (AR, CO, PS, AG, AP, LA, PP)	Agreement (DA, AM, AR, CO, AS)	Facilitative (15, 21, 31, 36, 41, 43, 51, 61, 79, 91)	Task Leadership (01, 11, 21)	Neutral Acts, Suggestions and Rational Arguments (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11)
Disrupting (CR, DG, CP, DR, EX, IN, NT, PU	Disagreement (DD, YB, RA CM, NC)	Dysfunctional (17, 22, 30, 32, 42, 45, 52, 92)	Conflict Dimension (31, 51, 52, 61, 62, 34, 44, 26, 36)	Resolution of Conflict (13, 15, 23, 26, 27 29)
	Communication Talk (BB1, BB2, MC, CR)		Affect Dimension (04, 63, 64, 06)	Interpersonal Reconciliation (19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28)
	Mindreading (MRB, MRF)			Appeal (31, 33, 35, 37, 40)
	Problem Solving (PL, NPL, R1, NR1, NRF)			Rejection (10, 43, 45)
	Summarizes Other (SO, SB)			Coercion and Attack (41, 47, 48, 51, 53, 55)
	Summarizes Self (SS)			
	Problem Feeling (GPT, RI, F, BL)			